

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of this amendment, which amends claims 1, 17-20, and 25-26, and cancels claim 4; claims 1-3, 5-26, 30-33 will be pending. In the office action, claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement; claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-19, and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jozawa et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,331 B1, hereinafter “Jozawa”); claims 9 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jozawa in view of Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,673, hereinafter “Wang”); claims 4, 20, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jozawa in view of Fiske (U.S. Patent No. 7,042,587); and claims 30-32 were allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments above and remarks below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Section 112 Rejections

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In the specification on page 11, there may be two extremes of coding classes, which are described as a skip mode and an intra mode. Fourteen other classes of coding modes in between these two extremes are also provided. Four bits are used to represent 16 different coding modes or classes. Applicants submit that a person skilled in the art would appreciate 14 different coding modes that are in between the skip mode and the intra mode. The different coding modes are based on block frame difference. Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 16 fully complies with the requirements of §112.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3 and 5-15, 17-18

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jozawa. Applicants submit that Jozawa fails to disclose or suggest generating a check value for the target code word and sending the check value and the index to a decoder, the index allowing identification of the set of the plurality of code words and the check value allowing the target code word to be determined from the set.

The office action states that a motion vector in Jozawa is calculated. Applicants submit that this does not disclose or suggest determining a check value for a target code word and sending the check value and the index to a decoder. The index allows identification of the set of the plurality of code words and the check value allows the target code word to be determined from the set. Applicants submit that the motion vector as described in Jozawa does not disclose or suggest a check value that allows a target code word to be determined from a plurality of code words. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-3 and 5-16 depend from claim 1 and thus derive patentability at least therefrom.

Applicants submit that claims 17 and 18 should be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 19-26

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jozawa. Applicants submit that Jozawa fails to disclose or suggest determining a target code word by operating on the code words in a set with a cue, the target code word being determined when a check value is determined for a code word that corresponds to the received check value. An index and a check value are received. The index is used to determine a set of candidate code words. Then, a code word is determined in the set of candidate code words using a cue. The code word is determined as the target code word when a check value determined for the code word corresponds to the received check value. Applicants submit that Jozawa does not disclose or suggest the above method.

The office action states that a target code word is determined by reference macro blocks and residual/code words. Applicants submit that Jozawa does not disclose or suggest that a code word is determined from the set of candidate code words by operating on the code words

with a cue. Also, Jozawa does not disclose or suggest that the determined code word is verified as the target code word when a check value is determined for the determined code word that corresponds to the received check value. Jozawa may disclose a motion-based predictor, but this predictor is not used to determine the target code word from a set of candidate code words. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19. Claims 20-24 depend from claim 19 and thus derive patentability at least therefrom.

Applicants submit that claims 25-26 should be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed with respect to claim 19.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly sought. The undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number below at the Examiner's convenience if it would help in the prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

TRELLIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PC

By /Brian N. Young/
Brian N. Young
Reg. No. 48,602
Tel.: 650-842-0300